

## NOTICE OF REJECTION

Patent Application Number	2004-000708
Date Prepared	March 12, 2009
Date Issued	April 7, 2009
Examiner	Yusuke AIZAWA 3460 5H00
Attorney	Yoshitaka SONODA <i>et al.</i>
Cited Article(s)	Article 29, Paragraph 2 Article 36

The present application is rejected for the following reasons. Should the applicant have any comments thereon, he/she should submit remarks within 3 months from the date of issue of this notice.

### Reasons

#### [Reason 1]

The inventions according to the below-cited claims of the present application could have been readily invented prior to the filing thereof by those having the average knowledge in the technical field to which the inventions belong based on inventions described in the below-indicated citations which were distributed in Japan or a foreign country or inventions that were made publicly available through electrical communication channels prior to the filing thereof, and are therefore unpatentable under Article 29, Paragraph 2 of the Japanese Patent Law.

### Comments

(see List of Citations for cited documents)

Claims 1-33

Citations 1-5

Comments

#### [Regarding Claim 1]

Paragraphs 0025-0029 and 0040-0046 of Citation 1 describe placing a real model provided with a camera (the "camera for capturing an image" of claim 1) in a battle space (corresponding to the "local site" in claim 1), synthesizing CG following the movements of a head-worn display device and images from the camera of the real model (corresponding to "registering the generated graphics to the image from the camera" and "registering the generated graphics to the image in dependence of the specified position and orientation" in claim 1) at the head-worn display device worn on a user's head (corresponding to the "specifying unit for specification of a position and an orientation in the remote site" in claim 1), and controlling the orientation of the camera (or real model) in response to information from position sensors in the head-worn

display device (corresponding to "the camera is arranged such that its position and orientation is dependent on the specified position and orientation" in claim 1).

Based on the description of Citation 1, those skilled in the art could have easily made the site at which the user wearing the head-worn display device is (corresponding to the "remote site, physically separated from the local site" in claim 1) different from the battle space where the real model is situated.

Additionally, please refer to the descriptions of paragraphs 0001 and 0005-0008 of Citation 2 and the Abstract and paragraphs 0006 and 0012 of Citation 3 as needed.

[Regarding claims 2-5]

See the above claims.

[Regarding claim 6]

See the descriptions of paragraphs 0042-0043 of Citation 1 and paragraphs 0005 and 0008 of Citation 2.

[Regarding claim 7]

See the descriptions of paragraphs 0005 and 0008 of Citation 2.

Additionally, paragraphs 0038, 0045, 0048 and 0074-0076 of Citation 4 describe detecting the positions of cards (corresponding to the "pointing device" of claim 7) arranged in a remote field, performing a designated three-dimensional display of the positions of arrangement of the cards (corresponding to "generating a graphical representation of a point being presently pointed out by the pointing member based on the position of the pointing device" in claim 7).

[Regarding claim 8]

Paragraphs 0029 and 0071-0076 of Citation 4 describe the use of an HMD in a main field (corresponding to the "local site" in claim 8) to display a virtual image superimposed upon a real image obtained from a camera (corresponding to "displaying a view comprising the environment of the local site and said generated graphics projected on the environment" in claim 8).

[Regarding claims 9-12]

See above.

[Regarding claim 13]

See the descriptions in the "Abstract" of Citation 3.

[Regarding claim 14]

See the descriptions in paragraph 0080 and Fig. 6 of Citation 4.

[Regarding claims 15-30]

See above.

[Regarding claims 31-32]

See the recitations of the claims and the descriptions on pages 20-21 and 30 of Citation 5.

[Regarding claim 33]

The invention of claim 33 could have been easily achieved by those skilled in the art.

#### List of Citations

1. JP-A H11-309269
2. JP-A H08-257948
3. JP-A H06-134687
4. JP-A 2002-247602
5. JP-T H09-505138

[Reason 2]

The recitations of the claims of the present application fail to satisfy the requirements of Article 36, Paragraph 6, Number 2 of the Japanese Patent Law with regard to the below-indicated points.

#### Comments

[Regarding claim 1]

The expressions "registering the generated graphics to the image from the camera" and "registering the generated graphics to the image" in claim 1 are unclear as to their linguistic meaning and indefinite as to their technical meaning.

[Regarding claim 2]

The recitation of claim 2 leaves unclear the technical meaning of what kind of device is meant by the "tracking unit" in claim 2.

[Regarding claims 4-6]

See above.

[Regarding claim 7]

The recitation of claim 7 leaves unclear the technical relationship between the "pointing device" and the "pointing member" in claim 7.

[Regarding claims 8-27]

See above.

**[Regarding claim 28]**

The category (device, method or method of production) of the "computer program product" of claim 28 of the present application is unclear.

(See Examination Standards, Sec. 1, Ch. 1, Description Requirements for Specification and Claims 2.2.2.1, Examples of Violations of Article 36, Paragraph 6, Number 2 (3).)

**[Regarding claim 29]**

See above.

**[Regarding claim 30]**

The recitation of claim 30 is unclear as to its linguistic meaning, as well as being indefinite in its technical meaning.

**[Regarding claim 31]**

The recitation of claim 31 leaves unclear the technical relationship between the "handheld display device" of claim 31 and the other features recited in claims 11 to 14.

**[Regarding claim 32]**

The recitation "the handheld device is arranged so that the user seems to look directly through the display" in claim 32 is a subjective and functional expression, the technical meaning of which is unclear.

**[Regarding claim 33]**

The recitation of claim 33 is unclear as to the technical relationship between "paint" in claim 33 and the other features recited in claims 1 to 13.

As such, the inventions of claims 1-33 are not clear.

Applicant will be notified of any new reasons for rejection if such new reasons for rejection arise.

(When submitting amendments together with remarks, Applicant should explain, in the remarks, the reasons for the amendments and the portions of the specification and drawings as originally filed that form the basis for support thereof.)

**Record of Prior Art Search**

Searched Fields	IPC	G06T 15/00-17/40
	DB	

This record of the prior art search does not constitute a reason for rejection.